

the relief of Suzuko Yagi and Anne Yagi, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert: "That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Suzuko Yagi, the Japanese fiancée of Andrew Bacnik, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and her daughter, Anne Yagi, and that said Suzuko Yagi and her above-named daughter may be eligible 'or visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Suzuko Yagi is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Andrew Bacnik, and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Suzuko Yagi and her daughter, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of Suzuko Yagi and her daughter, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of them as of the date of their entry into the United States, upon the payment by them of the required visa fees and head taxes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore granted to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the Members of this House has been drawn many times to the present proceedings of the Federal Communications Commission against Radio Stations WJR, of Detroit, WGAR, of Cleve-

land, and KMPC, of Los Angeles, the principal stockholder of these radio stations being Mr. George A. Richards. The Federal Communications Commission is threatening to deprive these stations of their licenses to operate because they allege that Mr. Richards had these stations "slant" the news. The Federal Communications Commission instituted these proceedings because of complaints filed with it by former discharged employees of these stations. In its prosecution of this case the Federal Communications Commission saw fit to use, as its star witness, a man by the name of Clete Roberts, who was one of the individuals filing a complaint and who also was a discharged employee. While on the witness stand, and under oath, this particular witness classified all the Italians in southern Italy as a "lazy and indolent people" and further stated that they were "not worth a tinker's damn."

On Wednesday, May 3, the Honorable ANTHONY TAURIELLO, Democratic Representative from Buffalo, N. Y., spoke out very forcibly against the Federal Communications Commission's support of this type of witness and against the conduct of the Federal Communications Commission in this case. On Tuesday, June 6, the Honorable STEPHEN M. YOUNG, the Democratic Representative at Large from the State of Ohio, supported the remarks of Congressman TAURIELLO and made his position very clear as to these present proceedings. On June 13 Congressman TAURIELLO again attacked the Federal Communications Commission and concluded his attack in joining with Congressman YOUNG in requesting that you, Mr. Speaker, designate a committee of both Republicans and Democrats to confer with the Federal Communications Commission immediately so that this House could have a full, nonpartisan report made to it with all the facts on the table.

Mr. Speaker, this particular case presents some very interesting questions which it would be well for us to take cognizance of at this time. I do not know Mr. Richards. I am not a listener to the stations involved. I have, however, made a thorough investigation of this matter and find that the Federal Communications Commission is well on the way to having a national issue come out of this case. For instance, I find that on Monday, March 13, Senator HOMER FERGUSON made a speech on the floor of the Senate with direct reference to this case, in which he inserted an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post captioned "Must propaganda be the monopoly of our leftists". Following this speech by Senator FERGUSON I find that on Tuesday, April 11, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, made a speech about this case on the floor of the Senate in which he inserted an editorial from the Washington Post which was captioned "Shadow of the censor." On Thursday, March 30, Senator BRIDGES continued his attack against the Federal Communications Commission. On Thursday, April 20, Senator BRIDGES still continued his attack against the Federal Communications Commission. On May 3, as I

above mentioned, Congressman TAURIELLO spoke and attacked the Federal Communications Commission's conduct of this case with specific reference to its support of such witness as Roberts. On Wednesday, May 10, Senator FERGUSON returned to attack in opposing the reorganization plan of the Federal Communications Commission. On Tuesday, June 6, as I also related above, Congressman YOUNG called for a nonpartisan approach to the very serious issues presented in this matter and, as also related, as late as Tuesday of this week, Congressman TAURIELLO demanded that some method be found through which it could be ascertained whether or not the Federal Communications Commission intended to continue to support their star witness, Clete Roberts.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members of this House will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering the remarks made in both the Senate and the House on this case as I have outlined them by date today, they will easily see that the Republican spokesmen are contending that the only thing at issue in these particular proceedings is the right of Mr. Richards to hold and to express his personal opinions. They contend that the Federal Communications Commission, when it charges Mr. Richards with having ordered the news "slanted," uses these charges solely for the purpose of exploring what is actually the personal and private opinions of Mr. Richards, and that by attempting to conduct their case on this premise they are usurping a power that it was never intended they should have. In other words, their charge is that the Federal Communications Commission is now attempting to control the thoughts of holders of radio station licenses and that their conduct in this case is very definitely one of "political censorship." As Congressman YOUNG and Congressman TAURIELLO have so aptly stated, the preservation of freedom of speech is certainly not one that the Republican Party can alone take credit for supporting. Furthermore, if the Federal Communications Commission does have in mind the hope that they will control what an individual radio station licensee thinks—or if they hope to bring about any form of censorship—then I, as an American citizen and a Democrat, line up solidly with the viewpoints of my colleagues in this House.

Mr. Speaker, it ought to be very clear to all of us just why the Republicans are so interested in this case. It also ought to be a solemn duty of ours to have a quick determination made as to whether or not the conduct of the Federal Communications Commission up to this time in this case has been beyond reproach. I take this privilege of pointing out to this House that when the Federal Communications Commission puts on the witness stand a man of the type of their star witness Roberts, and when this type of a witness makes such defamatory and ill-founded, such defamatory and stupid and such defamatory and insulting remarks against the Italian people, that these remarks have not gone unnoticed in any section of Italian-Americans in the United States of America. I say to

my party today that like all of us, no one could be more prideful of my ancestry than I am. I also say to my party that this man Roberts—when he refused to recant and apologize—in fact, gentlemen, he took the position as a witness for the Federal Communications Commission that these remarks were true and that he would stand by them—I say to you gentlemen that as a result of this every Italian newspaper in the country has been alerted and has criticized with scathing denunciation the Federal Communications Commission for supporting this type of a witness. I am now given to understand that these particular proceedings began again yesterday in Los Angeles and that the Federal Communications Commission—who must now begin its case over again due to the death of the former trial examiner—refuses to give Congressman TAURIELLO, and others, any answer as to whether or not it is their intention to put this witness back on the stand. This man may even at this moment be repeating under oath what I have already told you he has stated in the prior hearing.

Can you blame Mr. Hugh Fulton, who is the chief trial counsel for these stations, for excoriating and ripping this type of a witness to pieces and contending that he is not getting a fair hearing? Are we so naive that we cannot see how much damage an irresponsible individual like this man Roberts could do if we did not take steps to repudiate him as any good American should repudiate him? What then is the Federal Communications Commission hoping to accomplish? Can it be true that out of personal pique or spite or prejudice they have made up their minds to get this man Richards and to deprive these stations of their licenses because he held personal opinions which are against our administration? Can this be true? Is it that they started something that they are now realizing is akin to having the bull by the tail and they do not have the intestinal fortitude to recognize it at this time? I do not know what the issues are, but I do know that when an agency of our Government has to use the type of a witness as this man Roberts, there is something radically wrong with that agency of my Government. I do not intend to face my own constituents without my people knowing how resentful I am of such defamatory and scurrilous remarks. I want them to know that I will never support any agency of my Government or of my party that has to engage in the use of such a type of witness. Why is it that in all this time there has not been one word from any Commissioner or any employee of the Federal Communications Commission in which they could have at least made the simple, honest statement that insofar as that part of the testimony of Mr. Roberts is concerned wherein he attacked the Italian people, we, ourselves, repudiate such remarks. Why is it that there has not been one word from them or from anyone else of apology to the Italian-Americans in this country of ours because of what I have related? I said in the beginning that the Federal Communications Commission, by its conduct of this case, was rapidly creating what

could easily be a national issue. I say further that if the witness is put on the witness stand again by the Federal Communications Commission, the snowball of attack that is so rapidly increasing in size and momentum will reach proportions of no uncertain dimensions throughout the length and breadth of this country.

Mr. Speaker, may I seriously hope that the remarks of my esteemed colleagues from Ohio and New York—as well as mine today—will be given immediate and whole-hearted attention.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, last year the House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 298 establishing a House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. This committee was instructed, under the resolution, to investigate all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote or retard legislation. It was also instructed to investigate all activities of agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote or retard legislation.

A committee of seven members was appointed by the Speaker, with myself as chairman. Appointed to this committee were Representatives LANHAM, of Georgia; ALBERT, of Oklahoma; DOYLE, of California, on the Democratic side; and, on the Republican side, Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana; Mr. BROWN of Ohio; and Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota.

This committee organized in early October, and a week later held a further meeting in which the chairman, by motion, was authorized to proceed with the selection of the staff and to conduct preliminary investigations into the subject matter of this inquiry, during the congressional recess.

In November and December of last year, acting under the committee's specific authority, I organized a small staff of qualified people. I have several times invited the minority members of the committee to suggest persons for staff positions but they have preferred to leave that responsibility entirely to me. I interviewed a great many applicants and in addition, asked others who did not apply for jobs to see if they would serve. In every case I satisfied myself that the men and women I selected were competent persons and good citizens. They have adhered to the policies established by the committee, and in day-to-day operations have followed my instructions. I am proud of them all.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] has sometimes stated that he does not know who are the members of the staff. I cannot understand those statements. Last January every member of the committee, including the gen-

tleman from Ohio, was given a list of the employees and their experience, and a number of the employees have attended executive and other committee meetings. At a meeting of the committee in February the employment and identity of several investigators temporarily borrowed with the consent of the House Committee on Administration, from one of the investigative agencies of the Government were likewise described to the members of the committee, including the gentleman from Ohio. Furthermore, of course, all employees, including stenographers, together with the compensation paid, are a matter of public record at the disbursing office and are reported semiannually in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio has also implied that the investigators of the committee are sometimes given blank subpoenas signed by me. I have repeatedly assured the gentleman from Ohio that he need have no concern on this score. I have never signed a blank subpoena but only detailed, specific subpoenas in connection with particular investigations as the need has arisen.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point since he has mentioned my name?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to say to the gentleman and to the House it is true and correct that I made the statement that I did not know who was serving on the staff of the committee. It is also correct, as the gentleman has stated, that he has informed me that he did file or did furnish a record of employees back in January, which has been placed in a folder which has been in the committee room with my name on it, and which I had not seen until yesterday. If I remember correctly all the statements made yesterday in committee, the statement was also made that mention of some of these employees was contained in the official transcript of one of the committee meetings at which I was not present.

However, I would like to inquire of the gentleman: Is it not a fact that on yesterday you informed us as to the employment of a number of members of the staff who were not employed or included in the list which you said was furnished in January some time, and which I have stated I did not have the opportunity of seeing?

For instance, Miss Belle Zeller; when was she employed by the committee? She was not on the list. She had been a witness before the committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I might say in answer to the gentleman that the list, as mentioned, covered all those persons who were at that time employed, and at the executive session yesterday we listed those persons who have recently been employed by the committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I appreciate that statement, but is it not a fact that on yesterday you informed us of members who were employed since then?

Mr. BUCHANAN. At the executive session yesterday we listed those persons who have recently been employed by the committee and put on the list